

Deadline 2 Submission – Comments on Suffolk County Council's Local Impact Report REP1-130, with regard to Traffic and Transport issues.

- 1 Snape Parish Council is generally supportive of the PADSS and the Local Impact Report submitted by Suffolk County Council, but wishes to comment briefly on the issues of traffic and transport.
- 2 We find it helpful that in their recitation of the policy context at paras 11.26 and 11.27¹ of REP1-130, SCC quote from the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan:

11.26 Development proposals should be designed from the outset to incorporate measures that will encourage people to travel using non-car modes to access home, school, employment, services, and facilities;

11.27 Development will be supported where:... It is proportionate in scale to the existing transport network...

This is a very useful reminder of the context in which this project should be considered - even if it is nationally significant, or a critical national priority, regard should be paid to the local context as a whole, and not, as the Applicant seems to believe, only to individual and discrete aspects of their Proposed Project.
- 3 We note therefore that in para 11.77 of 'General Description of Network' SCC does not mention (for example) the A1152, which is indicative of a general tendency within the LIR to omit discussion of road network safety issues and mitigation anywhere outside the study area chosen by the Applicant. The A1152 is symbolic of the diversionary pressures that Snape Village will face if the Proposed Project proceeds, and acts as an attractor for traffic diversions whenever pressures build up on the A1094, for any reason. They certainly will as the cumulative construction effects of this and the SPR and SZC NSIPs bear down on our local roads..
- 4 We have noted in our response to the Applicant's REP1-116 the various ways in which traffic outside the applicant's study area will be badly affected by HGV activity within the area, especially in inter-project cumulative situations/phases, and we suggest that this has not been properly dealt with in SCC's LIR.
- 5 Mention in 11.77 that '*There are several B class roads linking the local settlements*' is insufficient. This section fails to stress that as traffic increases, a series of alternative routes to the south will be used, which as a Parish Council we know, from formal diversions for roadworks or flooding. Traffic through Snape is affected by five junctions with the A12 to the south of the B1121 – Friday Street, Farnham, Tinker Brook, Church Road at Little

¹ All references are to REP1-130 where not otherwise indicated

Glemham and the Lower Hacheston junction via Campsea Ashe; also, the B1069 leads to the A1152 at Rendlesham and leads on to Woodbridge. If drivers opt to avoid the A12 because of weight of traffic or because of delays at the Friday Street Junction/roundabout, there will be significant increases in traffic through the Parish, as we have noted in our WR response to this Applicant's REP1-116. These include traffic flows:

- from Saxmundham and north-east of Saxmundham using Sternfield Road and crossing the A1094 at Church Common to the B1069 south for access to the A1152 and the A12;
- on the A1094 from Leiston, Aldeburgh and eastern villages turning left initially at the B1069 junction but then perhaps later via the quiet lane Priory Road to join the B1069 in Snape Village, again for access to A1152 and A12;
- from the A12 using the A1152 through Eyke and Rendlesham to join the B1069 northwards and then on to cross the A0194 at Church Common or via a quiet lane rat-run.

These traffic increases will be the cause of road safety, congestion and air pollution impacts.

- 6 On the question of mitigation, we agree strongly with SCC's view in, for example para 11.221 of REP1-130 that the Applicant's proposals are inadequate in many ways. But we are disappointed that despite 11.221 (e) '*Lack of mitigation within a number of communities adversely impacted by construction traffic*', communities outside the study area are ignored. This continues at 11.222, where there is no mention (in the specific location or inter-project sections) of the important A1094/B1069 junction at Snape Church, which will be a focus of elective as well as planned diversions throughout the peak periods of the three overlapping projects we will be 'hosting' over the next decade, if this project proceeds as currently planned.
- 7 We urge SCC as a result of these concerns to press for a revised speed limit on the A1094, with a maximum speed of 40 mph (excluding the current 30 mph zone) between *at least* Snape Watering and the B1069 Leiston junction.
- 8 Finally, we note with regret that there is little consideration in the LIR of the physical effects on minor rural roads of poorly planned (because unconsidered in the Applicant's mitigation proposals and the LIR) diversions; and no mention at all of how the Applicant can and should protect Quiet Lanes from rat-running diversions.
- 9 **Summary:** Snape Parish Council very much appreciates the broad themes of the LIR, including the criticism of the Applicant's lack of junction modelling and the poor choice of baseline data, and we strongly support their conclusions, whilst wishing to go further on the points noted above - in the interests of our community.

Andrew McDonald for Snape Parish Council

09/12/2025